BRIEF REMARKS UPON Mr. WHISTON'S *New Theory of the Earth.*

And upon an Other Gentleman's *Objections* Againſt ſome Paſſages in a Diſcourſe of *The Exiſtence and Providence of God,* Relating to the *Copernican Hypotheſis.*

By *John Edwards,* B. D.

LONDON: Printed for *J. Robinſon* at the *Golden Lion*, and *J. Wyat* at the *Roſe* in St. *Paul's* Church-yard, 1697.

E.d 36

PRUDENTIA IN ADVERSIS
George Tollet Esqr

To my Worthy and Honoured Friend

Dr. *JOHN WOODWARD*,

Profeſſor of Phyſick in *Greſham* College, and F. R. S.

SIR,

THE *forming of theſe brief Remarks upon Mr.* Whiſton's Theory of the Earth *was occaſion'd by one of your Letters which you were pleas'd to honour me with: for your mentioning that Undertaking of his, and your curſory Glance upon it revived in me the thoughts which I a little before had of making ſome Reflections on that Attempt. And the Motive to it was this, my apprehenſion that this Learned Gentleman had not dealt fairly with the* Moſaick *Hiſtory, which (as I conceive) is a fault of a very high nature. I chiefly argue with him about his abandoning the literal Senſe, or the genuine meaning of the* Moſaick Creation. *But I hope this may excite a Reſolution in* you *to go further, and particularly to riſle his ſeveral* Hypotheſes, *which I queſtion not you are perſwaded are founded on a precarious bottom. In defence of*

your ſelf *you will be obliged to ſay ſomething to him, for you are a* Theoriſt *as well as he, and the* Earth *is your common Subject. But to the* Theoretick *part you have added* Experience *and* Obſervation, *whereby you have cultivated this Theme to a Prodigy, and are going on ſtill to oblige the World with greater and nobler Diſcoveries, the Conſummation of which we all with great impatience expect and long for.*

As to this little Eſſay of mine, the Bookſeller had notice of it, and in this Idle Time (*this* Stationers *Vacation*) *was pleaſed to call for it, to ſet the Preſs on work. I was not wholly averſe to the making it Publick, becauſe I knew there is this one thing to commend it,* viz. *the Goodneſs of my* Deſign, *which is to conciliate a Reverence to the* Moſaick *Writings, and particularly that part of them where the Firſt Formation of all things is treated of. In the firſt Chapter of* Geneſis *Moſes preſents us with the Primitive State of the World, and acquaints us what are the Firſt Principles and Rudiments of all things,* viz. *the* Chaos *and* Light. *All Terreſtrial, groſs and dark bodies were framed out of the firſt; and all Etherial, bright and tenuious bodies were eduted out of the ſecond. Whatever belongs to this* Earth *and the* Planets *which are of a reſembling nature had its original*

original from the former; and the Ether, Sun, and Stars, which appertain to the Superior part of the World, had their riſe from the latter. Theſe are the General Sources, theſe are the Primitive Materials of all viſible beings in the World; the one paſſive, dull and inert, the other active, ſubtile and brisk. On theſe two Principles, viz. *the* Chaotick Matter, *and* Light *or* Fire *there might be built a ſolid Syſtem of* Natural Philoſophy, *every way congruous to theſe and the other Diſcoveries of the Divinely Inſpired Philoſopher in this Chapter. The contrary is that which I make bold to cenſure and animadvert upon in the inſuing Papers, wherein I have ſhew'd that Mr.* Whiſton *makes his Philoſophick Principles jarre with Reveal'd Truth, and ſuffers his Mathematicks to confront the Bible.*

As to the Second Part of my Reflections, wherein I doubt concerning the Earths moving about its Axis, it may be I differ from you, *and from the generality of* Vertuoſo's *at this day. But truly I am not ſo much a* Tychonian *as to forſwear the* Copernican *Hypotheſis: but the Truth of the matter is this, when I was treating of the moſt Subſtantial Points of* Divinity, *that is, when I was aſſerting and vindicating the* Being *and* Providence of God, *I was unwilling to found*

theſe

theſe or any thing belonging to them upon an infirm and unſtable baſis, upon a dubious and diſputable Doctrine, and which had not long prevail'd in the Learned World. Such I take the Opinion of the Circumgyration of the Earth to be: and therefore till I could be abſolutely ſatisfied about the reality of it, I thought it was ſafeſt to aquieſce at preſent in the other Doctrine, and the rather becauſe it is ſuitable to the Mundane Syſtem which Moſes *preſents us with, whoſe Literal ſenſe of the Account of it is not to be ſlighted by Chriſtian Philoſophers. According to this Inſpired Sage the Grand Parts and Diviſions of the Material World were ranged and diſpoſed according to the Specifick* Gravity *of them (though the Laws of Gravity or any other ſuppoſed Mechaniſm were not every where obſerv'd in the* Creation, *nor any where exactly, it being below the Divine Soveraign Being to confine himſef to ſuch Laws) our* Earth *and the Planetary Bodies, which are of the ſame matter with it as to the main, have the loweſt place, becauſe they are heavieſt: the* Waters, *which are Ponderous in the next degree to the* Earth, *are accordingly ſituated next above the ſuperficies of it: the Atmoſphere of the* Air, *conformably to the degree of its weight, is above the* Waters: *and the* Ethereal, Luminous *and* Firy *bodies, as being*

being lighteſt of all, have the uppermoſt place This is the Order and Method of the Creation *according to* Moſes's *account of it, but it is inconſiſtent with the* Copernican *Circumvolation of the Earth and his Syſtem of the Heavens. If it be ſaid that this Terreſtrial Globe is a deſpicable Spot, a Speck, a Point in compariſon of the Vaſt and Spatious Congeries of the Sun and Fixed Lights, I grant it is ſo if it be meant of their Bulk and Quantity; but then this muſt be remembred that though the Earth be inferiour to the Solar body and the Stars on the account of Magnitude, yet it is far ſuperiour to them upon other Accounts, which are of mighty weight and moment: all which I have particularly mention'd and inſiſted upon in the* Second Chapter *of that* Diſcourſe *wherein I undertook to prove the* Exiſtence *and* Providence *of an Eternal Infinite and All-Wiſe Being from the Fabrick and Sructure of the World. If any perſon will be pleaſed to anſwer thoſe Arguments, and ſatisfie me about them, I faithfully promiſe him I will be his Proſelite, and I will declare that I am not enclin'd any longer to think that the Place of our Reſidence is not a Voluble Planet. I have lived to ſee Monſieur* Des Cartes's *Philoſophy introduced into the Publick Schools with great applauſe, and at laſt exploded: and this may be the fate of the* Copernican

pernican *Hypotheſis, though it hath been embraced ſome conſiderable time by the Greateſt Philoſophick Wits, who have now rendred it a Modiſh Opinion. Yet there may be a Time when its Faſhionableneſs ſhall expire, and when this Seat and Habitation of Mankind ſhall return to its* Reſt *again.*

But why do I thus treſpaſs? Truly, Sir, *I muſt partly impute it to* you; *for ſeeing you are wont to indulge me a great Freedom when I have the felicity to Communicate with you, I have made uſe of that Liberty now, and thereby am become Tedious. For which I beg your pardon, and requeſt nothing more paſſionately than that you would vouchſafe me the honour of letting me be Eſteem'd (what I ſo ſincerely am)*

SIR,

Your moſt Affectionate, faithful and humble Servant

Cambr June 16. 1697.

JOHN EDWARDS.

Of

OF THE *Moſaick* Doctrine OF THE CREATION.

BEING

Some brief Remarks on Mr. *Whiſton's New Theory of the Earth*;

In Vindication of the *Moſaick* Account of the Creation.

I Have in another place endeavour'd to prove (and I hope to the Satisfaction of the Learned and Judicious) that *Moſes's* Narration of the *Creation of the World* is Literal and Hiſtorical, and that it is a true and juſt Account of the whole Proceſs of that Divine Work. And this I undertook to make good in oppoſition to the fond Notions which had poſſeſs'd ſome men's heads, and had been divulg'd by their Pens, *viz.* that *Moſes* is not to be underſtood according to the *Letter*, that he ſpeaks to the capacity of the

Blockiſh *Brick-makers* that were newly come out of *Egypt*, and ſcarcely underſtood Common Senſe, and therefore any Story of a Cock and a Bull would ſerve them. When *Moſes* ſpeaks of the *Creation*, we are not to underſtand him as if he intended to give any True and Real Account of that matter, we muſt not think that he would trouble the brains (if you can ſuppoſe they had any) of a company of Dull Slaves with Natural Philoſophy. And when he ſpeaks of the formation of *Adam* and *Eve* and ſeveral things appertaining to it, we muſt not be ſo ſilly as to fancy a Literal meaning of the words, but we muſt take it all in a *Myſtical* and *Allegorical* Senſe. Thus the known *Theoriſt* dictates to the world. Where, by the way, obſerve how weak and ſhallow ſuch ſuggeſtions are, as if the firſt Chapters of *Geneſis* were to be read only by the people of that Age in which *Moſes* lived, as if none but Drudges and Slaves were to look into theſe Writings; or, as if theſe were ſo ignorant and ſtupid that they could not underſtand a plain and downright Narrative; or, as if theſe thick skinn'd Labourers, who were not capable of *Natural Philoſophy*, could judg of *Allegories*; as if thoſe who could not underſtand any thing of the plain *Hiſtory of the Creation*, were able to comprehend *Myſteries*, *Parables*, *Hieroglyphicks*, *Mythologies*; in ſhort, as if an Allegorical and Myſtical Senſe were eaſier than a Literal one. Theſe things duly weigh'd are ſufficient to ſhew the Vanity of that Writer's Diſcourſe.

Not-

Notwithſtanding this, another and a *New Theoriſt* hath lately ſo far imbibed his Notions as to ſhew little regard to the *letter* of *Moſes*'s Writings: which I take to be a very falſe Step, and a dangerous one, in a perſon eſpecially that is no Profeſs'd *Deiſt*, and by his Character ſeems to own the Authority of the Scriptures. It is very ſtrange and ominous that ſuch a one ſhould give ſo little deference to *Revelation* and aſſert things which palpably interfere with the Sacred and Infallible Records of *Moſes*. His Grand Propoſition is this, that *the Moſaick Creation extends no further than the Earth*, or (as he expreſſes it at other times) *Nothing but the Earth only is the ſubject of the Moſaick Creation*. This every where occurs in his Treatiſe, ſo that there is no need of aſſigning any particular page, as I ſhall do afterwards when I cite any other paſſages out of his Book. But who is there that hears this Propoſition named, and is not enclin'd to think that this Learned *Theoriſt* deſign'd to expoſe the Sacred Hiſtory of *Moſes*, and to erect a doctrine that abſolutely runs counter to the firſt words of the Bible, *In the beginning God created the heaven and Earth?* Here is a dichotomy of the Whole Viſible World into *heaven* and *Earth*, and therefore we cannot but infer thence that the *Heavenly Bodies* are a portion of that Syſtem which *Moſes* here deſcribes. Theſe words are an Epitomy and Abſtract of the *Creation*, more particularly and diſtinctly delineated afterwards in that chapter, and conſequently the *Moſaick Creation* extends to the *Heavens* as well as to the *Earth*.

But what ſaith the *New Theoriſt* to this? Why, he grants that in the forementiond Text *the Heaven* ſignifies the Heavenly Bodies, *viz.* the Sun, Moon, and Stars, but he denies that it is to be ſo underſtood elſewhere, and particularly in any part of this firſt chapter of *Geneſis*, for according to him *heaven* here is no more than the *Atmoſphere of the Earth*, or the *Region of the Air*, *p.* 11. Which is a very precarious and groundleſs Interpretation, for though it is true the region of the Air that ſurrounds the Earth is call'd *heaven* and *the firmament of heaven* in this chapter, as well as in other places of the Sacred Volume, yet we are to know that both theſe words *heaven* and *firmament* are uſed here in a Different Senſe. There is the *Lower* or *Aerial* Firmament, *v.* 6, 7. and there is the *Upper* or *Etherial* one, *v.* 14, 15, 17. And ſo *heaven* is either the *Lower Heaven*, which is no other than the Regions of the Air, or the Atmoſphere of the Earth; or the *Upper Heaven*, which is the *Æther*, or Region of the Sun and Stars. The former of theſe Heavens was the work of the *ſecond day*, and is diſtinctly mention'd in *v.* 8, 9. The latter is expreſly named in *v.* 14, 15. and was the work of the *fourth day*. The not attending to this diſtinction of the *Two Firmaments* or *Heavens* in this Chapter hath been one occaſion of thoſe Miſtakes and Miſapprehenſions which this Ingenious Author and ſome others of late have fallen under. But can there be any thing plainer than this, that there was a Double Firmament or Heaven, one (*viz.* the Expanſe of Air) *to be between the*

the waters and the waters, *v.* 6. *i. e.* to be placed between the Seas below and the Clouds above; the other (*viz.* the Ethereal Expanſe) to be the ſeat and receptacle of the Sun and Stars, *v.* 16, 17? *God made two great lights, he made the ſtars alſo, and God ſet them in the firmament of the heaven, to give light upon the earth.*

How then can it be true that *Moſes*'s deſcription of the *Creation* reaches no further than the *Earth*? Doth not this Hiſtory make particular mention of that Higher *Heaven* or *Expanſe* where the *Luminaries* are? doth it not acquaint us what was the *deſign* of the Allmighty in making it? Doth not *Moſes* in plain words relate that the Fourth Days Work was the creating of the *Heavenly* Bodies, from *v.* 14. to 20*th*? Doth he not mention the Celeſtial *Lights* in general, *v.* 14, 15. and then particularly *the two great lights*, *v.* 16. that is, the Sun, Moon, and other Planets, for they are all comprehended under theſe *two*, as being the moſt Eminent: which is no unuſual way of ſpeaking in Scripture. And the *Stars* alſo (in the ſame verſe) *i. e.* the *Fixed Luminaries* of Heaven are mention'd in contradiſtinction to the Other *Lights*. Is it not ſtrange now that, notwithſtanding this Evidence, any man ſhould ſtart up, and venture to maintain that *Moſes* in this Chapter ſpeaks only of the formation of the *Earth*? Could it be expected that one who hath ſo great a ſhare of Reaſon and Senſe ſhould thus talk? Is it not prodigiouſly abſurd that by *Lights in the firmament of the heaven*, and *Two Great*

Lights, and *the Stars alſo* all of them either by day or by night *to give light upon the earth*, we ſhould underſtand the *Earth*, and no more?

Another late * Writer ſaw how inconvenient, harſh and incongruous it was to do ſo, and therefore though he was pleas'd to exclude the *Stars*, *i. e.* the Fixed Stars from this Creation, yet he grants that not only the *Earth* but other *Planets*, and the *Sun* it ſelf were the matter of the Creation in this chapter. Indeed as for the *Stars*, this Gentleman makes ſure work with them; for he daſhes the word *Stars* out of the Text, which no Commentator or Critick ever ventur'd to do. But then indeed, as if he repented of his raſh act, he refers the word *Stars* to the verb *rule*, and forces a ſtrange and unheard of ſenſe on the place. I wiſh this Ingenious Writer had not too much gratified the *Deiſts*, whom he undertook to confute, by flying to ſo precarious and ſhifting a Gloſs on a plain Text of Scripture.

But our preſent Author out doth this Gentleman, and will have neither *Sun* nor any other *Planets*, nor *Stars* to be part of the Creation recorded by *Moſes*, although expreſs mention be made in this chapter of the *Lights*, both greater and leſſer, which were *ſet* or placed by God at the Creation in the Higher *Firmament*: and although it be ſaid *Gen.* 2. 1. *thus* (*i. e.* as was deſcribed in the former chapter) *the heavens and the earth were finiſhed and*

* Dr. *Nicholls*'s Conference with a Theiſt Part. 1.

and all the hoſt of them. Than which we could not have plainer words to expreſs the *Univerſal Frame* of the World, and every thing whatſoever that belongs to it, for the Inſpired Hiſtorian aſſures us that not only *the heavens and the earth* (which terms themſelves comprehend the whole Mundane Scheme) were finiſh'd in the ſix days Creation, but he adds that *all the hoſt* of them were finiſh'd likewiſe, that we might not have any ground of ſurmiſing (with this Writer) that *Moſes* gives us not an Account in the firſt chapter of *Geneſis* of the Whole Syſtem of the Viſible World. Yet our Author confidently avers that in the forementiond place *the heavens and the earth ſignify the Terraqueous Globe alone, with its Air or Atmoſphere, without including the Whole Univerſe, or ſo much as the Solar Syſtem, p.* 10. To me it ſeems very wonderful and ſurprizing that any Man of Learning and Ingenuity ſhould ſo openly and plainly confront the Sacred Writer, and miſrepreſent his Clear Account of the Creation of the World. I declare I would not have troubled the Reader with any of theſe *Reflections*, were it not upon this conſideration only, that this *Theoriſt* apparently ſhocks the Divine Revelation of the Holy Scriptures, and contradicts the plain Hiſtory of the Firſt Inſpired Penman. I take it to be a very ill work to deal thus with this part of the Bible, for the reſt of it may as well be treated after the ſame manner, and then in a ſhort time we may give up this Book to the *Deiſts* and their fellows.

It is not from want of Deference to Mr. *Whiſton* or his Parts and Worth that I thus ſpeak: I will be of the firſt that ſhall applaud his Ingenious Attempts; but that which extorts a Cenſure from me is this, that he hath the boldneſs to offer to the publick a *Theory* which is wholly inconſiſtent with the Hiſtory of *Moſes*. And in this Cenſure all perſons that pay a due reverence to the Scriptures, muſt needs concur with me. It is ill in a *Perſon* of his Figure eſpecially to undervalue the Holy Text, and thereby to conciliate in others (who are not ſo well acquainted with it) a diſregard of the Sacred Penmen and their Writings. This will be the natural reſult of ſuch Undertakings, and I am afraid hath been; for if ſome men were not *Deiſts* before their peruſal of ſuch Writings, theſe will make them ſo, becauſe they ſee there is no Reſpect given to *Revealed* Truth, and there is no care taken to conform their Notions about the *Creation* (of which *Moſes* only can give us an account) to the book of *Geneſis*.

But let us hear what the Worthy Author ſaith in defence of himſelf and his Interpretation. Firſt, he tells us, that *the Capacities of people could not bear an univerſal account of the origin of things*, p. 80. And again, *The Capacities of the Jews to whom* Moſes *peculiarly wrote were very low and mean, and their Improvements very ſmall, or rather none at all in Philoſophick Matters*, p. 82. And ſo p. 83. *The rude and illiteratte Jews were newly come from the Egyptian bondage, and deſtitute of the very firſt Elements of Natural Knowledg*: and this he gives

gives as a Reaſon why he aſſerts that the Narrative which *Moſes* gives of the Creation reaches no further than the *Earth.* Such jejune and childiſh Arguings can never have any power on Rational Minds, who delight not to be entertain'd with fancy, but ſolid Truth. But no man can count this Reaſoning to be of the latter ſort, for the Capacities of the people were able to bear a plain Relation of the formation of the *Heavenly* Bodies, no leſs than of the *Terreſtrial* ones. The Jews might as well have underſtood *Moſes* telling them that the *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars* were created, as when he tells them that the *Earth* was created. And accordingly we find that he relates the former of theſe, no leſs than the latter, though this *Theoriſt* pretends (even againſt the expreſs words of the Hiſtory) that there is no ſuch thing. And who but this Author and his Brother *Theoriſt* could have dreamt that there is any need of *Improvements in Philoſophick matters* to underſtand that the Sun and other Luminaries of heaven were made by God on the 4*th.* day of the Creation?

And I ſhould here alſo take notice of a great Miſtake, *viz.* that the Book of *Geneſis was peculiarly wrote to the Jews who came out of Egypt*, as he ſpeaks in the ſame place. Certainly, the deſign of penning it was more Catholick, it was intended for *all ſucceeding Jews* (to ſpeak of no others at preſent) not only ſuch as were *Illiterate* and *Rude*, but thoſe of ſufficient Knowledg and Underſtanding: and ſurely theſe might be of ſufficient capacity to bear

bear a plain and ſhort Narration of the making of the *Heavens* as well as of this *Lower World.* This ſhews that there is no foundation for the Opinion which this Ingenious Writer hath eſpouſed, but I hope will have thoughts of being divorced from by what I have or ſhall ſuggeſt?

Secondly, he tells us that though the *Sun* and other *Planets* were not part of the Creation which *Moſes* relates, yet they are inſerted into his Narrative of the *Six days Work*, becauſe he had a mind to gratify the dull ignorant people, the *rude* and *illiterate Jews* he ſpoke of before. Thoſe Heavenly Bodies are fetch'd in here *to comply with the Vulgar Notion, that they are part of the Clouds, or belong to the region of the Air.* p. 21, 22 It is true, it is not unuſual in the Holy Scriptures to condeſcend in ſome expreſſions to the Capacity of the Vulgar, and there is an Inſtance of it in this very Chapter, v. 16. but this is a quite different thing from giving a Set Narration of a Matter when there is really no ſuch thing as is related. Which is the caſe here, for this Writer holds that *Moſes*, to condeſcend to the apprehenſions of the people, tells them expreſsly that the Sun, Moon and Stars were created on the 4th day, and placed in the upper Firmament, though there was nothing of that nature, nothing *created*, nothing *then* made, nothing *in that place* Set. If it were only *Impertinency* that was charg'd upon *Moſes* by the *Theoriſt*, viz. that he brings into his Diary things that are nothing to the purpoſe,

poſe, that he hooks in the *Solar Syſtem* into the Hiſtory that appertains only to the *Sublunary World*, we might bear with it (though it is an ill Imputation, and unworthy of the Inſpired Writer) but when he charges him with Deceit and Falſity, it is not to be ſuffer'd. *Moſes* (as he grants) pretends to ſpeak in this Chapter of Matter of Fact, to relate the diſtinct time and proper place when and where things were done, and yet this Relation is not True and Real, but a miſrepreſentation, and a falſe account of things; for whereas *Moſes* mentions a certain Time and particular Day when the Lights of heaven were created, this Author peremptorily denies that they were created at that Time, and on that Day: and whereas *Moſes* tells us that the Luminaries were *ſet in the firmament of heaven*, he ſaith the true place of theſe bodies is not aſſign'd them, p. 18. However *Moſes* records it in his Journal, right or wrong, to pleaſe (and at the ſame time to deceive) the dull People. He and his Abettors would excuſe themſelves by ſaying, it is only *concealing the Truth*, but that is apparently falſe, for here is Actual Deception and Falſifying, becauſe here is a Poſitive and Downright relating of what was not True, and yet delivering it as True. As to what this Worthy Author ſaith, that here is a compliance with the Common Notions, *viz.* that *the Sun and Stars are part of the Clouds, or belong to the Region of the Air*, he makes the Vulgar more Simple and Ignorant then they are, to ſhew himſelf more wiſe than others in his interpretation of the place.

And

And eſpecially he forgets here (though he mentioned it before) that the Jewiſh Rabble were come lately from *Egypt*, and there we know there were ſeldom any Clouds, there being conſtantly a Clear and Serene Sky, ſo that it was Impoſſible they ſhould be bred up with this notion, *viz.* that the Sun was ſeated in the Firmament of the Air where the Clouds are. This was not thought of by our Author, otherwiſe he would not have averred that *Moſes* here accommodates himſelf to the Popular Humour and apprehenſion, and that he ſpoke to thoſe of the *Jewiſh* Nation who who were unlearned and Ignorant.

Thirdly, he offers this as an other ground of his ſtrange Interpretation, that though *Moſes* makes mention of the Sun, Moon and Stars in his Diary of the Creation, yet theſe great Luminaries of the world *were made before, and only now placed*, or ſeem to be placed, *in our Firmament*, p. 14, 15. *It is not neceſſary, ſaith he, to believe that theſe bodies were then firſt created when Moſes makes mention of them.* p. 14. Which is againſt the whole tenour, ſcope and coherence of the Chapter, and contrary to the Stile and Expreſſions in every part of it, which all run in the *Preter-perfect Tenſe*, not in the *more then perfect Tenſe*, as he would have it underſtood. Who can think that the Narrative concerning the *fourth days work* is to be Underſtood in a *different* way from all the Reſt? All things belonging to the *other* days works are ſet down exactly, and according to the matter of Fact, but here he fancies it is otherwiſe, the ſtile varies, and there

there was no ſuch thing as this days work: ſo that there was a Double *Sabbath* according to him, God reſted from the works of Creation on the fourth and on the ſeventh day. But however to fill up the ſpace, *Moſes* ſaith ſomething and makes us believe that there was ſomething done. And this he doth to ſuit himſelf to the Capacities of the Illiterate and Vulgar. Whence it might be inferred that in the Reſt of the Chapter he turns himſelf to the Learned and Wiſe, but then the Author differs from himſelf, for he had informed us before that among the *Jews* at that time there were no Philoſophers, but that they were all Idiots and Blockheads. Theſe are the ſtrange and wild notions of our *Theoriſt* and yet they are ſwallowed down, (though I hope but by few beſides himſelf) rather then the Literal and Plain Hiſtory of *Moſes* ſhall take place, rather than he will adhere to the Genuine ſenſe of the Text. And he himſelf acknowledges that all the other parts of the Chapter, excepting what relates to the *Fourth days work*, are to be taken otherwiſe, that is, they are meant of what was really done on thoſe Particular Days which are ſpecified, and there is no reaſon imaginable to make any Exception as to the Fourth day. He would come off by ſuggeſtions that *the Sun, and Moon and Stars are then ſaid to be made or created when they became Conſpicuous, and their bodies diſtinctly Viſible*, p. 23. ſo that according to this New Expoſitor they were not *made* till there was a clear Day or Night to *ſhew* them. The Author of this Conceit

is

is two Learn'd to perſiſt in it, and too ingenuous not to bluſh at it.

Fourthly, an other profound Reaſon why the Heavenly Bodies are thus placed by *Moſes* was to prevent Idolizing of them. It was *to ſhew us the unreaſonableneſs of all ſorts of Idolatry, or of the worſhip of any viſible beings, though never ſo uſeful and glorious.* p. 81. Nay, he tells us that *the ſecuring of the Jews from the adoration of the hoſt of heaven could not otherwiſe have been provided for.* p. 28. Till the force of this Reaſon can be apprehended we may truely ſay, there was poor *Proviſion* made againſt *Idolatry*, yea none at all. Unleſs he means all the ſtars, Fixed as well as others (which his Hypotheſis will not allow of) it could not be deſigned to obviate or hinder Idolatry: this every one cannot but apprehend. Or, can we imagine that the moſt Holy God would obviate *Idolatry* by downright *Falſifying?* Can we think that *Moſes* was inſpired to *Lye*, that the Heavenly bodies might not be *worſhip'd?* For ſo runs the Argumentation of this Gentleman, *Moſes* makes the Jews believe in this chapter that God created the Sun and other Luminaries on the fourth day, and that they belong to the Earth, and a part of this Syſtem, though there is no ſuch thing; but this he feigns as an Antidote againſt the Adoration of the Hoſt of Heaven. One would not have expected ſuch a poor way of Reaſoning from a man of *Poſtulata*'s and *Lemmata*'s. Who would think that one ſo well vers'd in *Hypotheſes*, *Phænomena*'s and *Solutions* ſhould diſcourſe ſo weakly? But this it is to abandon

don the Sacred Text, and not to adhere to the eaſy and obvious meaning of the Holy Ghoſt in theſe Writings, and in this Chapter more particularly. It is this that hath betrayed our Learned *Theoriſt* to ſuch ſtrange and unaccountable fancies; it is this that cauſes him to defend his Propoſition, *viz.* that the ſix days Creation extended no further than the bare Earth, and that the whole Syſtem of the Heavenly Bodies is excluded from this Hiſtory of *Moſes*, although in that very Hiſtory he finds it clearly recorded that the *Sun*, *Moon* and *Stars*, by which *day* and *night* are diſtinguiſhed, are part of the Six days Creation.

Next, I will obſerve that he is pleaſed to inform us of a New Calculation of Time: *in the primitive ſtate of the world days and years were all one.* Book 2. p. 81. And afterwards, *Both theſe Periods are exactly coincident, and both are performed in the ſame ſpace of time.* And then he thinks good to apply it, *The Works of Creation were finiſhed in ſix days, that is ſix years*, he ſaith. But how will he be able to reconcile this with *Gen.* 1. 5? *The evening and the morning were the firſt day*: and the ſame is ſaid of all the other days of the Creation. Here *an evening* and *a morning* are made the juſt limits of a *day*, and therefore a *day* at the Creation of the world was not a *Year*, for there is a greater number of *evenings* and *mornings* in the compaſs of a year. And ſo when we read that ſix evenings and ſix mornings were ſpent in the works of the Creation, we may rationally infer thence that theſe amount

not

not to ſix Years. And this Sagacious Writer would have made this Inference himſelf if he had not been tempted to the forſaking of the plain, intelligible and obvious ſenſe of the words, and changing the eaſy and natural interpretation of Scripture for a forced one.

Again, he thinks fit to ſymbolize with his Fellow-Theoriſt, and to raiſe the ſame Objection againſt the *Moſaick* Creation that he did. For thus you hear him objecting, p. 50 51. *The length of the days aſſigned is wholly diſproportionate to the buſineſs done upon it. The Third day hath two quite different, nay incompatible Works aſſign'd it And the Earth with its furniture takes up four entire days, when the ſun, moon and ſtars are crowded into one ſingle day.* And the Improbability, yea and impoſſibility of the Works aſcribed by *Moſes* to the *Sixth day* are aſſerted by him, Book 2. p. 89,90,91. Theſe Cavils might perhaps have become ſome profeſs'd *Lay-Deiſt* but they are unworthy of a perſon that bears an *Eccleſiaſtical* Badg, and who is ſuppoſed to believe *Moſes*'s writing, and not to find fault with Inſpired Hiſtory. Are *we* to judg of the *Proportion* of the Days Works at the Creation? Are *we* to ſet the Almighty his Task? are ſhallow heads to cenſure the Operations of the Omnipotent Creator? Muſt they meaſure every Days proceedings at the firſt formation of the world by certain Rules and Aſſignations of their own? This is intolerable, and no *Pagan* Philoſopher would have acted thus, for he could not but know that the Methods of a Divine and Infinite Agent tranſcend the conceptions of weak

weak and finite minds, and that the Supreme Being is not confined to our Proportions, but acts as he pleaſes. Natural and Common Productions are not the ſame with thoſe Primary ones. We muſt not argue from our ordinary Generations to that which was at the beginning of all things. There was an other way and method obſerv'd, and it is irrational and ſenſeleſs to make theſe a Pattern to them. Here was the Immediate hand of God, and therefore it is no wonder that the beginning, procedure and finiſhing of theſe *Days Works* were of a different nature from thoſe Works that have been ſince. There being an Extraordinary and Miraculous exertment of Divine Power, it is as unreaſonable as it is Irreligious to find fault with the Diſtribution of them. It is raſh folly to expect *Mathematical Congruity* in every Production, and to look for *Mechanick Laws* in the erecting of the Univerſe, in the Syſtem of the Heavens, in the Planetary Bodies, in the Sun and other Globes of Fire. It is incongruous to think that *Mechaniſm* was obſerv'd in the formation of theſe. But of this I will ſpeak more anon.

Only at preſent I take notice of the Agreement of the Two *Theoriſts* as to the Main, (though this latter in one place ſeverely chaſtiſes the former for the falſe ſteps he hath made in his *Theory*, p. 76, 77.) There is a perfect Union and Friendſhip between them in the point of enervating the *Moſaick* Hiſtory; only they do it after a *different* manner. The *Old Theoriſt* (now we may

call him ſo, ſince this hath dubb'd himſelf the *New one*) directly and profeſſedly rejects the plain ſenſe of the *Moſaick* Text, whereas this pretends to own it, but at the ſame time miſerably wreſts and perverts it. The one openly declares that what *Moſes* ſaith is not matter of Fact, but the other comes and acknowledges *in part* that it is an Hiſtorical Account, but denies that it is ſuitable to the Reality of things: it is a Hiſtory, but Falſe. The former plainly and in downright terms owns his diſlike of the *Literal* meaning of that part of *Geneſis*, but the latter though he admits of the Literal ſignification, yet craftily and ſophiſtically diſtorts the ſenſe of the words, and puts a force upon them. The firſt uſes more freedom and ingenuity, telling the world without more ado that the *Hiſtorical* ſenſe is not to be admitted; the ſecond pretends to own the Account of the Creation, as to the very Letter, but baffles it all by uncouth Expoſitions. Thus though the two *Theoriſts* take a different Method, yet they unite in expoſing the *Moſaick* Writings.

It is Melancholy Reflection when we conſider how men are hereby taught to vilify the *Scriptures*, to diſpute the *Moſaick* Verity, to quarrel with the *Creation*, to look upon the ſeveral Stages and Proceſſes of it as feigned, and becauſe they are not adjuſted to ſuch Meaſures and Proportions as theſe perſons fancy, to vote them to be falſe and counterfeit What can a well-meaning and ſober Reader think when he finds our preſent Author diſparaging and traducing the *Moſaick* Creation

ation as *unreasonable, unequal, irregular, indecent, disproportionate, disagreeable to the Divine Wisdom, unsuitable to the nature of things*? for these are the Epithets he bestows upon it, p. 57, 65. What can he think when he finds him professedly *Ridiculing* of it, p. 57. and representing it *as unbecoming the simplest Artificer*? What can any man think and imagine, I say, but this, that our *Theorist* hath a mind to null the Authority of *Moses*'s Writings, to lessen the esteem of other parts of Scripture, to set Revelation and Reason at odds, to vacate all Reveal'd Truth, and in a word, to gain Proselytes to *Deism*? I am exceedingly troubled to let such words as these go abroad into the World; but I should be much more so, if I did not upon this occasion deliver my thoughts, If I did not freely tell the world what my Resentments are as to this matter. I never taught my Pen to write either for Ostentation, or for Preferment, but I have labour'd to bring it up an obedient servant to Truth, and I hope it will never be ashamed of so Honourable a Master. In so Sceptical an Age as we live in it becomes us not to be Indifferent; yea, we are obliged to be very Warm and Concern'd, and not to let *Temper* (as 'tis now fashionably call'd) chill our *Religion*, and betray the *Truth*. And I use this Freedom the rather because I deal with a Person of Ingenuity, who approves of a due Liberty in Discourse, and will both give and take it. I only suggest what Standers-by may *think* concerning his way of Writing, not what

he *deſigns*, for I will not entertain an ill thought concerning him as to that. I only remonſtrate againſt his unwary giving *occaſion* to his Readers to cavil at the *Moſaick* Account of the Creation, and thereby to open a door to the evacuating of all the Hiſtorical part of Scripture.

But what are the Reaſons that are aſſigned by this Ingenious Gentleman and his Aſſociates why they reject the *Moſaick* doctrine about the Formation of the World? They are theſe four eſpecially, which I will briefly touch upon.

Firſt, They oppoſe *Moſes*'s Account of the Creation becauſe it favours not their Opinion and Conceit of the exiſtence of ſome Other People in the World beſides thoſe of *Adam*'s race. This Author talks of the *Inhabitants*, not only *inanimate* but *animate and Reaſonable in the other Planets*, p. 40, 41. And he is at it again p. 58. *There may be millions of other Species of Noble Creatures not inferiour to Man*, p. 91. And therefore the *Moſaick* Hiſtory is a poor mean thing, becauſe it takes not in thoſe other Inhabitants of the World, it brings us no tidings of the people that dwell in the Moon. But they ſhould rather argue thus, the *Adamick* race, and no other is mentioned by *Moſes*, and thence we may rationally conclude that there is no other, for it being *Moſes*'s buſineſs to ſet down the *Origin and Riſe of Mankind*, if there had been another ſtock of them, he would certainly have told us of it. But he doth no ſuch thing; yea, on the contrary, he aſſures us that *Adam* and *Eve* were the firſt Perſons that were created, and particularly that *Eve*

was

was the Mother of all living, Gen. 3. 20. *i. e.* the ſource and Original of all men and women that are in the world: and therefore an *Other* Generation of Humane kind is a mear dream and fiction. But it is probable, ſay they, that the Moon and other Planets are furniſh'd with Animals like our ſelves, ſeeing they are as capable of Inhabitants as our Earth. I anſwer, No man can tell that. Though they be groſs and ſolid bodies, and therein be like our Terreſtrial Globe, yet they may not be a fit dwelling for any ſort of Living Creatures, for Man eſpecially. And indeed why ſhould any man think that Men like our ſelves were originally placed in the *Planets*, when we are aſſured that theſe Heavenly Bodies were made for the *Uſe of Men upon Earth only?* But of this afterwards.

Secondly, they fancy that *Moſes*'s Deſcription of the Creation is not ſuitable to the Greatneſs and Vaſt Extenſion of the World: they are of opinion that he talks too much of the *Earth*, and gives too Magnificent a Character of it, whereas the *Smallneſs* of it deſerves no ſuch thing. Accordingly this Author inſiſts a long time upon this, p. 54, 55, 56. And urges that it is an Inconſiderable Spot in reſpect of the Vaſt *Heavenly* Bodies, which ſtand Still till that wheels about. For this reaſon they diſcard *Moſes*, and are not a little diſpleaſed with him becauſe he is no *Copernican*. But theſe Gentlemen are to be told that they weakly argue from the Vaſt Proportion of the reſt of the World in compariſon of the *Earthly*

Globe, for 'tis not *Greatneſs* and *Bulk* that give a value to things. They diſcourſe idly and injudiciouſly who extol the Orbs of *Heaven* merely becauſe they are Vaſt and Spatious, and deſpiſe the *Earth* becauſe it is but a Point in regard of them. No man of true and generous Philoſophy can argue thus: No, it is impoſſible he ſhould, unleſs he can firſt prove that *Bulk* is *Worth*. *Judea* was but a ſpot in reſpect of the Whole Earth (the ſame that the *Earth* is in reſpect of the *World*) yet God made choice of this ſmall inconſiderable portion of ground to be the Scene of the moſt Glorious things that ever happen'd ſince the Creation. Why then may we not think, or rather why do we not believe it (ſeeing it is ſo Evident and Bright a Truth) that the Supreme Being created this Pittance of Earth for great and glorious ends, to be the Stage of the Worthieſt tranſactions in the world, and conſequently to dignify it above all other parts of the Univerſe, be they never ſo Great and Large? And it is certain he did ſo, and we may ſee it plainly in the Firſt Chapter of *Geneſis*. It is obſervable that the Whole Material World is divided into *heaven* and *earth*, v. 1. and therefore this latter, the *Earth*, can be no mean part of it. And we cannot but take notice that this poor Pightel, this *Moaicum* of Earth (as you may call it) is deſcribed and repreſented by *Moſes* as the Main and Principal Work and Concern of the All-Mighty, and pre-

preferable to all the Heavenly Bodies, and the Whole Univerſe.

Therefore we have no reaſon to quit *Moſes* for *Copernicus*, but to believe that the *Earth*, though ſo ſmall a Globe, is of greater dignity than all the Celeſtial Syſtem, than all the Planetary and Fixed Lights. They that diſcourſe otherwiſe betray a great Narrowneſs of Soul and Meanneſs of Spirit, becauſe they ſet a value upon Space and Quantity, and dote upon Roomth and Magnitude, which are of no real worth and eſteem: but at the ſame time they undervalue the Order and Appointment of the Soveraign Maker and Diſpoſer of the World, who plainly ſhews us the Tranſcendent Dignity and Superlative Excellency of the *Terreſtrial Syſtem* in his allotting more Time for the creating of that and what belongs to it than all the reſt of the World, and would thereby convince us that the *Earth*, as ſmall as it is, is the Nobleſt and Choiceſt Part of the World.

Thirdly, They can't be brought to acknowledge that the Heavenly Bodies, yea and the Whole World *were made for the uſe of Man*: and on this account likewiſe (as well as thoſe before mention'd) they caſt off the *Moſaick* Hiſtory of the Creation, becauſe it favours not this Opinion of theirs, but repreſents Man as the Lord of all the Creatures, and him for whom (next to the Divine Being) all things were made, and more particularly the *Heavens* round about him. Our *New Theoriſt* can't indure to hear of this: it is a doctrine which he utterly explodes, and in

order to that depretiates and vilifies *Mankind*, p 89, debaſing him to the nature of a *Flie* or a *Worm*, in the Works of the Creation. So low, ſo ignoble, ſo groveling is he in his thoughts, and ſo injurious to his *own kind*. It is true, he would ſeem to applaud Mankind as a Noble and Glorious Creature, p. 90, and he takes notice of the Dignity of Man, Book 4. Chap. 1. p. 253: but then we are to remember that it is uſual with this Author to claſh with himſelf: what he aſſerts in one Part of his Book he renounces in another, as might be evidenc'd in ſeveral Inſtances, but that is not my buſineſs at preſent. Though 'tis highly improbable that there are any other Creatures of humane kind that receive any advantage and profit from the Creation, yet he declares that *it is not wiſe and rational, it is not worthy to be believ'd of the All-Wiſe God* that he chiefly or ſolely created the World for our uſe, p. 70. He pronounces it *inconſiſtent with the Divine Wiſdom to make thouſands of glorious bodies for the ſole uſe of a few fallen and rebellious creatures*, p. 69. And after he had enlarg'd upon it, he concludes that *it argues the moſt extravagant degree of folly*, p. 71. But ſofter terms would have become him, when he was ſpeaking of ſo high a matter: and I queſtion not but he would have uſed them if he had Thought before he ſpoke, that is, if he had thought and conſider'd how Noble a Being Man is, and that he was deſign'd by his Maker to be the Flower and Top of the Creation, and the Glory of the Viſible World,

and

and that he hath the peculiar honour to have his Nature united to the Deity: He that hath ſuch apprehenſions of Man, can't think it ſtrange that even the Sun, Moon, and other Planets which more nearly environ him, and even the Fixed Globes of Light and Fire, though at a vaſt diſtance from him, were created for his Uſe and Service in ſome manner or other. They were made to ſhed their *Influences* on Mankind here on earth, (which is expreſs'd by their *Ruling the day and the night*, Gen. 1. 16, 18.) and *to give light upon the Earth*, which alſo is twice mention'd, *v.* 15, 17. Even the vaſt multitude of *Fixed Lights*, which are meant by the *Stars*, v. 16. or at leaſt are comprehended under the *hoſt of heaven*, Chap. 2. V. 1. were made for this very purpoſe, and conſequently for the *Service of Man*.

This is confirmed from what we are told concerning thoſe Glorious Creatures, the Angels, *viz.* that they are *Miniſtring Spirits, ſent forth to miniſter* for Mankind, more eſpecially *them who ſhall be heirs of ſalvation*, Heb. 1 14. It is no wonder that the *Heavens* and all the Glorious Bodies in it are Servants to Men, when the very Celeſtial Inhabitants are ſo. It would have been accounted a wild and extravagant Notion that thoſe Superiour Beings ſhould be Waiters and Tenders on the inferiour ones, unleſs the Infallible Writings had aſſured us of it: but now being aſſured of this, we may be reconciled to that other Truth, that the *Heavens* ſerve Man, and that the *Sun* and all the *Luminaries* are

Ser-

Servants to the Earth, and officiouſly roll about it, whilſt it ſtands to receive their Influence. This is congruous to the Divine Greatneſs and Majeſty, who hath made *Man* his Vice-gerent in this lower world, and hath conſtituted the Earthly Globe the place of his Reſidence, in which reſpect it is more excellent than all the Heavenly Bodies. But I have ſpoken ſomething of this in an * other place, and therefore ſhall add no more now.

Fourthly and laſtly, they hold that the Formation of the World was according to the ſtrict laws of the *Mechanick* or *Corpuſcular Philoſophy*; and therefore ſeeing *Moſes* repreſents it not as ſuch, they give no credit to his Writings about this matter. It is particularly alledged by our preſent Author that his New Hypotheſis of the Earth is exactly according to the laws of *Mechaniſm*, and thence he concludes it to be Authentick. But the Conſequence ought to be denied for this reaſon, becauſe he can never prove that the Creation of the World was comformable every ways to the *Mechaniſm* of bodies and the laws of Common Nature. We muſt not think that the Origin of all things was in the ſame manner with the After-productions. Rather we are to conceive that the ordinary way and method which have been obſerv'd in Nature ever ſince, were not obſerv'd at the Creation; for Common and Second Cauſes had

* Of the Exiſtence and Providence of God, Chap. 2.

had nothing to do then, the Divine Power and Influence peculiarly interpoſed, and the Creation was a work of Infinite and Miraculos Power and Wiſdom. An Immediate and Extraordinary Hand ſet things on work at the firſt erecting of the World, ayd conſequently no *Mechanical* Laws can explain it. I know our Author ſeems to agree to this, **The change of the Chaos*, ſaith he, *into an habitable world was not a mere reſult from any neceſſary laws of Mechaniſm independently on the divine power, but it the proper effect of the influence and interpoſition of Providence.* Nay, that the Whole Work and Proceſs of the Creation was not from mere *Mechanick* Laws, but from the immediate operation of the All-mighty, and an Extraordinary and Miraculous Power, he aſſerts in ſome pages together, Book 4. Chap. 1. where he inſtances in ſeveral Particulars of the Creation.

But ſo it is, this Gentleman hath a faculty of jarring with himſelf, for in other places he diſowns all this in three whole pages (36, 37, 38) he argues about the *Moſaick* Chaos from the *Properties of bodies*, from *the manner of their productions*, from *the law of Gravitation*, and expreſly avers that at the firſt Creation of the Earth all was done *according to the known laws of matter and motion*, and therein miſtakes and miſinterprets the *Moſaick* Creation. Beſides, he would not have complain'd

* Book 3. Chap. 1.

plain'd that in the Scheme of the Moſaick Creation *bodies alike in nature have an unlike original*, and again, *bodies unlike in nature have a like original*, p. 65 and that the *Light appeared before the creation of the Sun from whence it is derived*, &c. he could not poſſibly with any conſiſtency of Senſe have diſcours'd thus, unleſs he had ſuppoſed that all that was done in the *ſix days* was according to the Ordinary Proceſs of Nature. Again, when he finds fault with the *diſproportion* of the Days Works (as hath been obſerv'd before, and as you may ſee p. 41. *The Time of the Creation of each body was ſo diſproportionate to the Work it ſelf as is perfectly irreconcilable to the divine wiſdom of its Creator, and the accounts of the Works themſelves as they are ſet down by* Moſes.) It is apparent to every intelligent man that he proceeds upon the Laws of *Mechaniſm*, and verily thinks that theſe were exactly obſerv'd in the making of the World: which falſe Notion is one Cauſe of his Falſe Hypotheſis. We have mean conceptions of the Syſtem of the World if we think it is no more than a Clock or a Watch. The Supreme and All-mighty Being doth not confine himſelf to *Mechaniſm* and the Common Principles of Natural Motion. And therefore it is vain to undertake to ſolve all the Phænomena's of bodies by them, and to attribute all their effects to the common force and operation of *Mechanick* Powers, which, as I apprehend, is the fault of this Learned *Theoriſt* and ſome others.

Thus

Thus I have briefly touch'd upon the *Reaſons* and *Grounds* why theſe perſons relinquiſh the *Moſaick* Account of the Creation, and conſequently the Syſtem of the World founded upon it, and why they take *Copernicus* or *Cartes* to be better Writers than *Moſes*. In the *Firſt Reaſon* that they aſſign they are Fantaſtical, and dream of a World of Inhabitants in the Moon and the other Planetary Bodies. In the *Second* they are Childiſh, and eſteem things by their Bulk and Shew. In the *Third* they are Sneaking, and debaſe themſelves, and take no notice of their Noble Nature. In the *Laſt* they debaſe the All-mighty himſelf by tying him to Mechanick Laws. And in all four they ſeem to diſcourſe unreaſonably, unphiloſophically, unſcripturally. They fly to precarious Evaſiſions of Scripture, and give ſuch a fanciful account of the Inſpired Writers words (which are plain and intelligible of themſelves) that the *Theiſts*, and ſome in a Form above them, cannot but confeſs themſelves deeply obliged to them The number of thoſe that undervalue the Holy Oracles is great already, and I fear ſuch Treatiſes as theſe incourage them, eſpecially when penned by perſons of that Character and Order. Thoſe of the Sacred Function, above all others, ſhould be very Cautious leſt they offend in this kind. They ought to take care that they interfere not with the Letter of Scripture, that they diſtort not the ſenſe of the Sacred Text, and prevaricate with the Book of God; and particularly that they reject not the plain Hiſtory of *Moſes*, that they at-

attempt not to run down his Account of the Creation.

Our Theoriſt, I *conceive*, hath been extremely delinquent as to theſe things, he hath thrown down *Moſes* to erect himſelf, he hath made bold with the Firſt Chapter of *Geneſis* to introduce and eſtabliſh his own *Theorems* and *Hypotheſes*, ſuch as Theſe, that the Chaos was the Atmoſphere of a Comet, that a Comet paſs'd by the Earth at the Deluge, *&c.* and others about the Revolution of the Earth *not till* Adams Fall, about the Change of its *Figure*, about *Paradiſe*, about the *Abyſs*, about the *Planets*, &c. which are Precarious Notions, and have no ſolid foundation in Reaſon, Nature, or Scripture to ſupport them. All which a * late Writer of a free and brisk Genius hath thought fit to expoſe, and even to ridicule. But it is not my buſineſs to treat this Gentleman at that rate: I only obſerve that he ſeems to have no regard to the Sacred Hiſtory whilſt he is giving an Account of the Phænomena of the Earth.

But yet this is not ſaid as if I were ſo ſtrait-laced as to abridg this Excellent Writer in any thing of an *Indifferent* nature, or to debar him of a *Philoſophical Freedom*, or to lay reſtraint upon him as to any Diſquiſitions that are Ingenious, and in the leaſt Probable. But all this might be done without entrenching upon *Moſes*. He might, and ought to have

* Dr. *Nichols's* Conference with a Theiſt, Part. 1

have adjuſted his Notions to the Text, and made them comport with *Moſes*'s Hiſtory, and built thereupon a Rational *Theory*, and a Scheme of Philoſophy conſiſtent with *Geneſis*. But it was his Infelicity to take a Contrary Method, to uſurp upon the Holy Writ, wantonly to oppoſe the natural and obvious meaning of it, to offer ſuch Interpretations as give occaſion to perſons to ſlight the Sacred Volume, and to diſregard that ſenſe and meaning of it which lie plain before them.

To conclude, I conſider'd the *Miſchief* and *Danger* which might accrue to the world by that extravagant Liberty which I apprehended Mr. *Whiſton* had indulg'd himſelf in: I conſider'd that ſuch daring Flights as theſe might prove fatal to *Young Students* in *Philoſophy* and *Divinity*, and teach them to erect their own Hypotheſes upon the ruines of the Sacred Text: I conſider'd how injurious theſe Attempts are to the Scriptures in general, and how derogatory to the Spirit of God who indited them: and the ſenſe of this alone (without any other Inducement whatſoever) moved me to uſe this Plainneſs and Freedom with ſo Worthy and Learned an Author.

OF

OF THE

Motion of the Earth.

AN

Anſwer to ſome *Objections* againſt ſome paſſages in my late Diſcourſe (entituled *A Demonſtration of the Exiſtence and Providence of God*) relating to the *Copernican* Hypotheſis of the diurnal Revolution of the Earth.

A Learned Gentleman was lately pleas'd to do me the honour to frame ſome *Objections* againſt the *Second Chapter* of the *Firſt Part* of my Treatiſe, wherein I endeavour'd

'd to evince the Being and Providence
God from the Works of the Creation.
, he cenſures that paſſage Page 25. *The*
meaſures about a thouſand miles in an hour.
thinks I have not uſed the *right method of*
culating the Sun's motion. I muſt confeſs
him I was not very Studious about that,
ing diſheartn'd by the great *Difference of*
putations which I obſerv'd in the Authors
met with. It is well known how diſcre-
nt the Calculations of Aſtronomers are.
nave ſeen in my time a good many Writers
that ſubject, but I could never light upon
ny one that ſatisfies that Point: wherefore
choſe rather to pitch upon a Common and
Vulgar Computation than to trouble the
Reader with the ſeveral Opinions of Aſtro-
nomers, or to offer one that might ſeem in-
redible. Herein I conceive I have done
nothing amiſs. And truly if the *Objector*
had been Impartial, *i. e.* had conſulted one
part of my Diſcourſe as well as the other, he
would not have found any occaſion for an
Exception againſt the foreſaid paſſage. If he
had been pleas'd to take notice of p. 60.
l. 15, *&c.* theſe words would have ſilenc'd
his Scruples, *As to the motion of them* (viz.
the Planets) *there is a great diſagreement*
among Writers: therefore what hath been ſaid
before as to this, muſt be ſubmitted to thoſe that
are able to judge of the different Hypotheſes.
Here is *ſubmiſſion*, but it is not regarded: here
was a modeſt acknowledgment of the Author's
inſufficiency to give a juſt and accurate Ac-
count of the *Motion* of thoſe heavenly bo-
dies: and a Candid and Ingenuous Reader

OF THE

Motion of the Eart

AN

Anſwer to ſome *Objectio*
againſt ſome paſſages in m
late Diſcourſe (entitule
A Demonſtration of th
Exiſtence and Providen
of God) relating to th
Copernican Hypotheſis c
the diurnal Revolution c
the Earth.

A Learned Gentleman was lately pleas
to do me the honour to frame ſome
Objections againſt the *Second Chapter* of the
Firſt Part of my Treatiſe, wherein I endea-
vour'd

vour'd to evince the Being and Providence of God from the Works of the Creation. Firſt, he cenſures that paſſage Page 25. *The Sun meaſures about a thouſand miles in an hour.* He thinks I have not uſed the *right method of calculating the Sun's motion.* I muſt confeſs to him I was not very Studious about that, being diſheartn'd by the great *Difference of Computations* which I obſerv'd in the Authors I met with. It is well known how diſcrepant the Calculations of Aſtronomers are. I have ſeen in my time a good many Writers on that ſubject, but I could never light upon any one that ſatisfies that Point: wherefore I choſe rather to pitch upon a Common and Vulgar Computation than to trouble the Reader with the ſeveral Opinions of Aſtronomers, or to offer one that might ſeem incredible. Herein I conceive I have done nothing amiſs. And truly if the *Objector* had been Impartial, *i. e.* had conſulted one part of my Diſcourſe as well as the other, he would not have found any occaſion for an Exception againſt the foreſaid paſſage. If he had been pleas'd to take notice of p. 60. l. 15, *&c.* theſe words would have ſilenc'd his Scruples, *As to the motion of them* (viz. the Planets) *there is a great diſagreement among Writers: therefore what hath been ſaid before as to this, muſt be ſubmitted to thoſe that are able to judge of the different Hypotheſes.* Here is *ſubmiſſion*, but it is not regarded: here was a modeſt acknowledgment of the Author's inſufficiency to give a juſt and accurate Account of the *Motion* of thoſe heavenly bodies: and a Candid and Ingenuous Reader

could not but infer that the like was ſuppoſed in the Caſe before us. We are not able to determine in a matter where there are ſo Various Sentiments. My deſign was to repreſent to the Reader the All-mighty Power and Infinite Wiſdom of the Supreme Being in ordering the Courſe of the Celeſtial Luminaries, and eſpecially of the Solar Globe: and this deſign I thought ſufficiently accompliſh'd by a General Computation of the Suns Motion, and not by deſcending to Nice Calculations, which would rather amuſe and diſtract than give any Satisfaction.

Next, as to what I had offer'd againſt the *Motion of the Earth*, he objects that *I have not dealt fairly with the* Copernicans, *for I have produced their trifling and leſs weighty Reaſons, but have conceal'd the ſtrongeſt.* If this be ſo, then I muſt tell him, that *Kepler* and *Galileo* (Great Names in Aſtronomy) were *Triflers*, then *Lansbergius*, *Varenius*, *Gilbert* had no *weight* in their Arguments; then *Copernicus* himſelf was a very eaſy and mean Arguer, and defended his Poſt but ſlightly. I could mention a Learned Writer who is now alive, the Worthy Mr. *Ray*, one of whoſe Arguments for the *Copernican* hypotheſis is * *the vaſt diſproportion in reſpect of Magnitude that is between the Earth and the Heavens, and the great unlikelyhood that ſuch an infinite number of vaſt bodies ſhould move about ſo inconſiderable a ſpot as the Earth:* and this is the Chief Argument he propounds. And this, with others which I produced, were

* The Wiſdom of God in the Creation, p. 180.

were made uſe of, and earneſtly urged by other Learned Writers of great Note and Repute. Now, who would have thought that the *Modern Copernicans* would confeſs that the Arguments which the Firſt Founders of the Opinion made uſe of, and which the Chiefeſt Writers produc'd to bring men off from the other perſwaſion, were ſo *Light* and *Trifling*? Or if they were Strong Reaſons at firſt, how came they now, by my expoſing them, to be weak? Or, if the Worthy Perſons before mention'd thought fit to inſiſt upon them, can any man give any reaſon why I might not propound them as the Topicks made uſe of for that Cauſe? It will be difficult to return a ſatisfactory Anſwer to theſe Queries. No, ſaith this Gentleman; for though thoſe foreſaid Philoſophers found out, or retrieved the Earths Circumrotation, yet we of late found out the *True Reaſon* of it. And what is that, I pray? *The true Reaſon of this Hypotheſis is this, its ſuitableneſs to the laws of Mechaniſm.* This is the Great *Arcanum* which our late Worthies boaſt they have had the happineſs to bleſs the world with.

But I deſire theſe two things may be conſider'd.

Firſt, this is a Reaſon which was never inſiſted upon by *Copernicus*, the firſt Reviver of this Hypotheſis, nor ſo much as mention'd by ſome of the Greateſt Followers and Aſſerters of his doctrine, as I'm ready to prove out of the Authors themſelves, if it be denied. Thoſe things which I alledg'd, and which this Gentleman calls *trifling*, are the *Principal Arguments* which the generality of *Copernicans*

cans urge for their Opinion. They did not ſo much as underſtand the word *Mechaniſm*, they had never heard of ſuch a term. *Gaſſendus*, who gives a ſummary account of all the Reaſons produced for this Hypotheſis, reckons up thoſe very ones which I gather'd out of the Authors themſelves: only he argues indeed from the Motion of the Planets, which is uncertain and dubious; but he hath not a ſyllable about *the laws of Mechaniſm*. Tell me then, is it credible that the Firſt Inventers and Eſtabliſhers of an Hypotheſis ſhould not be acquainted with the *True Reaſon* why they threw off the receiv'd Opinion, and embrac'd another?

Secondly, They that at this day uſe theſe Terms know not how to apply them to the preſent purpoſe. I deny not the Excellent Uſe and Advantage of the *Mechanick* Philoſophy (of which I have ſpoken in another place) for moſt of the Great and Brave Diſcoveries of this Age in *Phyſiology*, *Medicks*, &c. are owing to this: but that which I aſſert at preſent is, that it is no ways applicable to the matter in hand, *viz.* the Hypotheſis of the *Copernicans*: for there is not one of them, ſo far as I can judg, that hath ſolidly ſhew'd and prov'd the agreeableneſs of the Earths Circumgyration to the *Laws of Mechaniſm*. There is a late Writer that talks as much of the *Mechanical* Laws of Motion as any man, but though he aſſerts the Diurnal Circumvolution of the Earth, yet * he holds that in the time of Mans Innocence there was

no

* Mr. *Whiſton*'s New Theory, Book 1 and 2.

no ſuch thing, but that it was the effect of Man's Fall, and immediately follow'd upon the *Curſe* on the Earth, and is part of its *Curſe*. Whence it follows that the Earths Motion was not the *Primitive* ſtate and property of it; it was not *Natural* to it, but preternatural, inordinate and irregular, and conſequently not according to the ſtated laws of *Mechaniſm*. And as for the Other Authors who endeavour to ſolve the Earths Motion in a *Mechanical* way, it is evident that they are not able to effect what they have undertaken. And how indeed can we expect they ſhould do it, when we find them diſagreeing about the *Mechanick Laws?* There never was a greater diſſention among Natural Philoſophers than there is about this one thing, as appears from comparing the Writings of *Des Cartes* (who was the Firſt Subſtantial Author of *Mechaniſm*) Dr. *More*, Dr. *Burnet*, Mr. *Newton*, Dr. *Woodward*, Mr. *Whiſton*, and other Philoſophical Men of this age, who have built their reſpective and different Hypotheſes and Theories on their different notions of *Mechanick* Principles and Agents. They *all* pretend to proceed upon *Mechanical* Laws: their Solutions are founded on the Natural Tendency of Matter: and yet we ſee how wide their Notions are from one another, and how their Hypotheſes are contradictory to each other. Which plainly ſhews how fallacious an Argument *Mechaniſm* is. And if we ſpeak *particularly* of the matter now before us, who ſees not how differently theſe Principles and Laws are applied? Some Writers (as this preſent *Objector* himſelf acknow-

ledges) making out the *Copernican* Hypotheſis by the notion of *Vortices*, others by that of Mutual *Gravitation* about a Common Center.

Firſt, ſome think the Motion of the Earth demonſtrable from the *Vortices*. So the Great *Des Cartes*, and the famous Dr. *More* in one of his *Epiſtles*; and there are others that eſpouſe this part of the *Carteſian* Phyſicks. But it were eaſie to ſhew how improbable an Hypotheſis this is on ſeveral accounts: for it puts a Force upon Nature, becauſe according to *Des Cartes*'s own Principle all bodies moving Circularly endeavour to get free of that motion, and to alter the Center: ſo that there is nothing like *Natural Motion* in the hypotheſis of *Vortices*, but all is Violent, and againſt the eaſie known laws of *Mechaniſm*. The *Vortices* are impetuous Torrents of fluid matter continually emptying and diſcharging themſelves: the *Poles* of every one of them are made forcible Dreiners for the *Eclipticks*, and there is a conſtant diſgorging and evacuating of ſuch and ſuch a Set of Particles, accompanied always with a violent emiſſion, impulſe, and protruſion. So that without *Revelation* we may tell that there is *War in heaven*, perpetual juſting and tilting, jarring and fighting. Among the *Vortical* Orbs, Celeſtial and Planetary, there are Commotions and Tumults, and the World is in a Continual Hurly-burly, a Pell-mell, a Confuſion. That the *Vortices* keep their Station, and are not ſwallow'd up of one another is a Miracle. One would think that it is impoſſible but that they ſhould encroach upon one another, according to the nature of that violent and rapid

pid motion which the Author of them hath deſcribed. The truth is, no conſiderate and thoughtful man can apprehend how the World hath been able to ſubſiſt ſo long as it hath, on the ſuppoſition of that make and compoſition of the *Vortices*

Moreover, it might be proved that the doctrine of *Vortices* deſtroys the common notion of *Gravity*, *i. e.* the deſcent of heavy bodies to the Center, that it muſt neceſſarily hinder the Sun and Stars from being ſeen, that it is utterly inconſiſtent with the Steadineſs of their motions, and the certainty of their Revolutions, that it is irreconcileable with the Flux and Reflux of the Sea, *&c.* This and much more may be made good concerning the *Vortices*; which renders *Des Cartes's Syſtem* precarious.

And indeed the Excellent Author himſelf thought it to be no other: in his *Philoſophical Principles*, part 3. Sect. 45. and in two or three other places of his Writings (as thoſe that are acquainted with them know very well) he confeſſes it to be but a bare *Hypotheſis*, he lets us know that he took the liberty to feign and invent this. And indeed any man of caſtigate thoughts can't but perceive that it is a mere *Romantick* ſtrain that this *Earth* of ours was once a *Sun*, and that *all the World* was *Heavens* at firſt. This is Ingenious and Fine, but not Solid. The World of *Whirl-pools* is a World of *Monſieur Des Cartes's* own making. He intended it only for a *Philoſophical Expedient*, which might ſerve to give an account of the Phænomena in the Heavens and the Earth: but it is all Sup-

poſition, and you can't build a Body of Natural Philoſophy upon it, nay you can't evince the *Earth's Motion* (which is the thing contended for) from this ſuppoſal. Hence it is that ſome Great Philoſophers of this Age labour to eſtabliſh this doctrine on another Hypotheſis: which they would not do if they thought the *laws of Mechaniſm* as grounded on the Opinion of *Vortices*, were true and ſolid. They would acquieſce in this, and not look out for ſome other way to give a Solution of the Problem: but we ſee they are diſſatisfied, and fly to ſome other way of ſolving this doctrine of theirs.

Secondly then, if *Vortices* cannot do it, *Gravity* muſt. This is another Principle of *Mechaniſm* that is relied upon. The Chief Perſon of late that manages this is the Learned and Profound Mr. *Newton*, who in his *Princip. Philoſ. Math.* tells us that there is Reſt in the Common Center of Gravity, and if the Sun be the Center then it reſts, and the Earth moves about it. But firſt, who is there that, weighing the ſeveral Syſtems of the World, (the *Ptolemaick*, *Tychonick*, &c.) ſees not how difficult it is to determine what part of the Univerſe is its *Center?* The Learned *Brahe* thought he ſpoke and argued like a Mathematician and Aſtronomer when he defended the *Earths Centreity*. Again, Mr. *Newton* himſelf ſeems not to hold that the Sun is the Center of the Mundane Syſtem: nay he owns expreſly in his 10*th Propoſit.* the diſtance of the Solar body from the Center of Gravity, which reſpects it ſelf, and all the Planetary bodies, with the Earth. Beſides, this Mechanical Prin-

ciple

ciple which is ſtiled *Vis Centripeta*, or *Gravity*, is very obſcure and doubtful, and therefore unſatisfactory, becauſe of the Different (if not contrary) hypotheſes it is built upon, according to the Various apprehenſions of Philoſophical heads. From the diſcrepancy of their notions, and their ways of ſolving this Phœnomenon we are able to gather only this, that the Problem of *Gravitation* or *Non-gravitation*, and the ſuppoſitions and ſolutions about it have puzzled the Wits of the profoundeſt Vertuoſo's, and conſequently we have no Sure footing here.

Further, the Laws of *Gravity* can ſcarcely be ſaid to be *Mechanical*: for *Gravitation* is not a Mechanick Principle, becauſe it flows not from the Nature of Bodies, they being in themſelves of a Paſſive nature, and therefore cannot tend towards other Bodies, or draw them to them. There is no ſuch Activity in mere Corporeal and Material Beings, and conſequently the laws of the Univerſal Tendency or Attraction of Matter, which are ſuppoſed, muſt have another Spring. Dr. *More* in his *Metaphyſicks* will let you know that they proceed from an Higher Principle, that they can't be ſolv'd in a mere Mechanical way, that they are above and beyond all the force of Mechaniſm, and depend wholly and entirely on the Divine Omnipotent Mover. But then you will ſay, the Gravity of bodies is a *Miracle*: for the notion we have of a *Miracle* is, that it is ſome Occurrence which is above or contrary to the fix'd courſe of Nature. To which I anſwer, tho' it is true the main and chief thing which conſtitutes a *Miracle*, is that it ſurpaſſes finite

finite power, and is the reſult of an Omnipotent Agent, yet there are other Properties which muſt concur to denominate a *Miracle*, as *Rarity* and *Wonder*; but theſe two are wanting here, for *Gravity*, and the Effects of it are common and uſual, and (as the conſequent of that) beget not Admiration and Amazement, and for theſe reaſons we ſtile them not *Miraculous*. But notwithſtanding this, we may hold that they are things that exceed the power of mere Nature, they are not from the efficiciency of Matter, in what manner ſoever moved, but are immediately from a Divine hand. *Gravity*, ſaith a late * Learned Writer, *is above, beſides and contrary to the nature of* Matter, *and is the effect of a Divine Power and Efficacy which governs the whole world*; nay, he ſticks not to ſay, *of* † *a Supernatural and Miraculous Influence*. And an ‖ other Ingenious Gentleman ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe.

Laſtly, as to *Mechaniſm* it ſelf, the laws and rules of it are very diſputable, and therefore we can't ſolidly argue from it. The Renowned *Carteſians* (that Great and Mighty Genius of Mechaniſm, whom all the Learned World admires and applauds) proceeds upon and proves all by *Mechanick* Principles in his Theory of the Celeſtial and Terreſtrial Bodies, but yet we find that ſeveral of his Principles and Maxims have been rejected ſince by very Wiſe heads, and great Judges in Mathematicks. Let One ſpeak for all, * *Des Cartes's Rules*, ſaith he, *concerning the transferring of motion from one body in*

* Mr. *Whiſton's* New Theory, book 1. p. 6. † Book 4. chap. 1. ‖ Dr. *Bentley*, Serm. 7. * Mr. *Ray's* Wiſdom of God in the Creation, p. 34.

in motion to another in motion or in reſt, are the moſt of them by Experience found to be falſe, as they affirm who have made Trial of them. Here then is no Certainty, there is no proceeding on *Mechanical* Laws in the preſent Controverſy: which was the thing to be proved.

This is what I had briefly to ſuggeſt concerning the *Two Mechanick Principles* which the Learned *Objector* founds the *Motion of the Earth* upon And now I appeal to himſelf whether he can alledg theſe as a *grand* and *weighty reaſon* (as he expreſſes it) of the Phænomenon he defends, ſeeing they are ſo Uncertain and fickle, ſeeing Naturaliſts ſo widely differ about them, and can't agree in aſſigning the *Mechaniſm.* Any rational man will infer hence that we can not rely upon this doctrine in the preſent Caſe. This I think is very clear and plain, and therefore let not the *grand* and *weighty* reaſon of *Mecaniſm* be brought to prove the *Circular motion of the Earth*, till there be an agreement about the *Nature* of it. Though Dr. *More* and Mr. *Newton* (who are the worthy perſons our *Objector* cites) make the Motion of the Earth the neceſſary effects of *Mechaniſm*, yet they do it upon *different* grounds, they proceed on Mechanick laws of Motion which are *diverſe* from one an other, and depend on different Hypotheſes; therefore a third perſon cannot build upon either of them. How can a man found the Earths Circulation on *Vortices* or *Gravity*, when the Authors and Founders themſelves prove it not from the ſame Mechanical Principles, but ſuch as contradict each other? for ſuch are *Gravity*

or

or the ſubſiding of bodies, and the *Whirling them round.* If we had a mind to make uſe of theſe Hypotheſes of thoſe Great Men, we can't (if we would) adhere to *both* of them, becauſe they ſo vaſtly differ; therefore *One* of them only can be pitch'd upon, but *which* of them is hard to determine, and this Gentleman himſelf doth not aſſign which of them he intends to own as the True Principle.

If you ſtick to the *Vortices*, you will be liable to the *Witty Atheiſt* you mention, for the *Vortices* are look'd upon by the Judicious as only an Ingenuous Invention. If you rely upon the *Principles* of that other Worthy Gentleman you quote, he will fail you as to any thing that looks like *Demonſtration*, for he is oblig'd firſt to prove and demonſtrate his ſuppoſed notion of *Gravity*, and the *Cauſe* of it (wherein he differs from very Great Philoſphers and Vertuoſo's) before he can maintain that Point. And I need not tell you that if *his Principles* be queſtionable, then *your Inferences* from them (which are the Main of your Argument) muſt be ſo too. You proceed upon ſome Suppoſitions which that Excellent Perſon hath eſpouſed, he betaking himſelf to a Particular way of Philoſophizing which moſt pleaſes him: but unleſs you can abſolutely prove that what he ſuppoſes concerning the nature of *Gravity* is certainly True, in my opinion you effect nothing, I mean nothing that is certain and indubitable: for otherwiſe I grant that you have moſt elaborately eſtabliſhed the *Newtonian Hypotheſis*, and the *Earths Motion* on

that

that foot: but if that foot be infirm, as I conceive it is, then all your Arguing is of that nature alſo and you ſtill want a πῦ στῶ to move this Globe. The ſhort of all is, if you ſtrike in with *Cartes* and *More*, you muſt renounce the *Lucaſian* Profeſſor: if you make choice of this laſt, you muſt caſhier the other two.

Where then is this *Demonſtration* of the *Copernican* hypotheſis from *Mechanical* Principles which is talk'd of? I grant what this Gentleman ſaith, that *upon ſuppoſition of Vortices the motion of the Earth is proved as fully agreeable to Mechaniſm as a Boats ſwiming down the ſtream, if left at liberty*: but then it muſt be prov'd that there is this *Stream* in the make of the Earth and of the Heavenly Bodies too, which he attempts not to prove. And as for *Gravitation*, as it is repreſented by that Celebrated *Mathematician* he quotes, and the laws of *Mechaniſm* conſequent upon that, which he infers from the *dimenſions of the Planetary Syſtem*, I need not inform him (he being ſo well acquainted with it) that there hath been, and is at this day a great a diſagreement among the Learnedeſt Aſtronomers about the diſtance of the Planets from the Earth, and from one an other; there have been profeſs'd Diſputes and Quarels about this, and accordingly there muſt be a diſſention about the *Dimenſions* of thoſe bodies: and conſequently if their Calculations be various, there is no Arguing from thence; we can't judg of the *Mechaniſm of the Plannets* becauſe we are ſtrangers

to

to their juſt *Dimenſions*, and the laws of their *Motion* depending thereupon.

When I conſider'd theſe things, when I obſerved how obſcure, uncertain and precarious the Principles are on which the *Earths Motion* is grounded, I thought it beſt (in my Diſcourſe of the *Exiſtence and Providence of God*) to lay aſide this New Hypotheſis. Becauſe I was not well ſatisfied with the Account which the Moderns give of it, I choſe rather to retain the *Tychonick Syſtem*, as being leaſt incumber'd with Objections and Difficulties. Of which an Intelligent Philoſopher of this Age (whom I mention'd before) was ſenſible, and therefore declares himſelf no Stickler for the *Copernican* Hypotheſis, but very fairly and ingenuouſly profeſſes that * *he doth not poſitively aſſert it, but only propoſes it as an Hypotheſis not altogether improbable.* But as to what I have offer'd, the *Atheiſt* (be he as *Witty* as this Gentleman can make him) hath no advantage by it, (whatever he ſeems to ſuggeſt:) nay rather, it would have made for him if I had founded the *Providence* of the Almighty on ſo tottering a baſis as the *laws of Mechaniſm*. The Cauſe would have receiv'd a great prejudice from the uſing of an Argument ſo weak and dubious. Then it would have been diſputed, whether the Penman of the Book of *Geneſis* or Monſieur *Cartes*, or whether he or Mr. *Newton* were the better Author: or rather it would have been plainly ſeen that there is a greater deference given by ſome men to the latter then to the former,

* *Mr. Rays* Wiſdom of the Creation, p. 183.

former, and that the Philoſophical Principles of the one are prefer'd to the Inſpired Writings of the other.

But the Truth of the matter is this, the Merits of that Cauſe I undertook, *viz.* the *Proof of the Divine Providence*, were not concern'd in this Controverſy, For whether one or the other hypotheſis (*viz.* the *Reſt* or the *Motion* of the Earth) be true is not material as to the Main Buſineſs: and ſo much I intimated in that Diſcourſe, p. 57. l. 7. &c. *After all, if the Copernican hypotheſis ſhould be true, that is, if the Earth rolls about on its Center, and ſo turns it ſelf to the Sun in its various poſitions, yet ſtill there are the ſame Effects of this that there were of the other Revolution*, viz. *that of the Sun; the good and benefit of mankind are promoted, and the Power and Goodneſs of the Great Benefactor are declared.* And I had ſaid before, p. 49. *The motion of the Earth is a precarious Opinion, ſo far as I have hitherto diſcerned.* By which words I ſhut not out future Convictions, and I let the World ſee that I am not Peremptory in my determination, but that I believe the Power and Wiſdom of God may be evidenc'd from both hypotheſes. Yet it was and is my perſwaſion that the doctrine of the *Earths Reſt* is more probable and accountable then that of its *Moving*: there is more to be ſaid for its ſtanding Still then for its taking a Turn about the Sun. At leaſt I ſhall continue in this Opinion till the Writers who are of the other ſide agree upon a better way of explaining and proving what they aſſert. *Archimedes* was modeſt who demanded a Place

to

to ſet his foot on, an to plant his Engines, and then he would undertake to move the Earth: but ſome of the Gentlemen of the *Copernican* way pretend to do this without any ſolid *Footing*, and without any *Machins* but thoſe of their own Ingenious Brains, which it muſt be confeſſed are very ſtrong and powerful, but not powerful enough to effect this Buſineſs they Undertake. I hope then I may without offence retain my Perſwaſion, till I ſee it confuted by Solid Arguments, and ſuch as as are founded upon unſhaken Principles. Seeing this Learned *Objector*, who is of ſo deep a Comprehenſion, is not pleas'd to produce ſuch, I am apt to think that none elſe can.

I only obſerve in the laſt place, that he is for a Neutrality, and would have me *treat both hypotheſes with indifferency:* but he ſets me a Task which he is not willing to perform himſelf, for he hath ſhew'd himſelf in what he writes to be a great favourer of the *Copernicans*, in direct Oppoſition to the other ſide. We can preſcribe that to others which we take no care to obſerve our ſelves.

ERRATA.

PAge 27. line. 6. for *ayd* read *and*, p. 28. l. 1. r. *the ſeeming*, l. 7. after *thus*, add *in way of except.on*, l. 8. r. *war really*, p. 30 at the bottom r. *Part* 2. The other Errata's you are deſired to pardon, the Author being abſent from the Preſs.

FINIS.

YALE U L